

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln No. 10/037,814

Amdt date January 11, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 21, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office action mailed on October 21, 2004. Claims 29 and 30 have been canceled. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 19, and 22 have been amended. Specifically, claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 19 and 22 have been amended for clarity. Moreover, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 29 and 30 respectively. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 19-22, 25, 27 and 31 are now pending in this application. Reconsideration on the basis of the above amendments and remarks below is kindly requested.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 19 and 22 based on informalities. These claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner to overcome this objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-11, 25, 29 and 30 as being obvious over Voser, U.S. Patent No. 4,449,012 in view of Yonechi et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,966,434. The Examiner also rejected claims 12, 19-22, 27 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voser and Yonechi et al. as applied to claim 1 and in further view of Nakagome et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,422,718. As now amended, claim 1 includes the limitation of claim 29 and requires that "a plurality of component core members allow for the winding of the conductor around the drum." Claim 7 as now amended requires the limitations of claim 30 and requires "winding the conductor around a drum." Claim 19 requires "wherein the conductor is capable of being wound a drum." Furthermore, all claims are generally directed to a conductor or a method of producing a conductor having a solid core.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**Appln No. 10/037,814****Amdt date January 11, 2005****Reply to Office action of October 21, 2004**

Voser discloses an overhead dual telephone cable which in FIGS. 5 and 6 appears to have central core members 36 and 42 made from a bundle of fibers which are arranged to form a centrally arranged bundle of fibers. The alleged core member of Voser does not appear to be solid as required by claims 1, 7 and 19. Thus, the combination of Voser and Yonechi can not render claims 1, 7 and 19 obvious.

Furthermore, Yonechi does not disclose a central core member which is formed from polygonally shaped component core members, but rather discloses high tensile filaments which are circumferentially arranged and which in cross-section appear to be polygonally shaped. At best, Yonechi teaches the use of circumferentially arranged filaments, each having a polygonally cross-sectional shape. There is no teaching in neither Voser nor Yonechi to form a central core from polygonally shaped core members for the purpose of allowing the cable to be wound around the drum. Furthermore, since the alleged core of Voser is formed from individual fibers which are not solely circumferentially arranged, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Voser with Yonechi as suggested by the Examiner. There is no reason provided by either reference to shape the fibers forming the bundle disclosed in Voser, which is alleged to be a central core, to have the cross-sectional shape of the filaments disclosed by Yonechi. As such, applicants submit that claims 1, 7 and 19 are not rendered obvious by Voser in view of Yonechi for either of the aforementioned reasons.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**Appln No. 10/037,814****Amdt date January 11, 2005****Reply to Office action of October 21, 2004**

Claims 2-4, 6 and 25 are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1. Claims 8-12 are dependent from claim 7. Claims 20-22, 27 and 31 are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 19. Claims 1, 7 and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance over Voser in view of Yonechi. As such, applicants submit that these claims are also allowable over Voser in view of Yonechi for the reasons provided for the allowability of claims 1, 7 and 19 over these references and for additional limitations that these claims contain therein.

If it is the Examiner's contention that Voser discloses a central solid core, even though that does not appear to be the case from the disclosure of Voser, then the cable of Voser would probably not be capable of being wound around a drum. Furthermore, neither Voser nor Yonechi disclose, teach or suggest the forming of the central core from a plurality of polygonally shaped members to facilitate the winding around a drum. In fact, absent applicants' disclosure herein, there is no motivation provided by either reference to be combined or suggested by the Examiner. Thus, applicants submit that claims 1-4, 6-12, 19-22, 25, 27 and 29-31 are also allowable over Voser and Yonechi for this additional reason.

The rejections and objections to all claims pending in this application are believed to be overcome and this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns about the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln No. 10/037,814

Amdt date January 11, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 21, 2004

allowability of this application, the Examiner is kindly requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss them.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Constantine Marantidis
Reg. No. 39,759
626/795-9900

CM/dlf

DLF PAC-99788.1--01/11/05 2:09 PM